

**REMARKS**

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated February 6 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-27. By the present amendment, claim 13 has been amended to correct a typographical error and to properly designate the dependency of claim 13. Additionally, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 21, and has canceled claim 27. Accordingly, claims 1-26 remain pending. The Applicant respectfully responds to the Examiner's Detailed Action and requests the Examiner place all pending claims detailed in the application in a state of allowance in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

**A. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Takahashi (US Patent No. 6,686,833), hereinafter referred to as "TAKAHASHI." Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejection, the Applicant has amended the claims to expedite the prosecution of the application.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Applicant has amended the independent claim to include limitations that relate to selecting the speaker from a plurality of different speaker, wherein each speaker has a different mechanical vibration component; a sweep signal for the plurality of different speaker; and drive circuitry configured to drive each of the plurality of different speakers at a sweeping frequency that cause each of the speakers to vibrate.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to include limitations where a speaker is selected from a plurality of different speakers, wherein each speaker

resonates at a different resonant frequency; a driver generates a drive signal in a frequency range for the plurality of different speakers; and control circuitry where each speaker vibrates in the excitation frequency range for the plurality of different speakers.

With respect to independent claim 14, the claims has been amended to include limitations where a range of mechanical resonant frequencies is determined for a plurality of different speakers; a sweep range and a sweep frequency is determined for the plurality of different speakers; and sweeping a drive signal across the sweep range and the sweep frequency so each speaker vibrates in the speaker's excitation range.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to include limitations related to selecting a speaker from a plurality of different speakers, wherein the plurality of different speakers have a predetermined range of mechanical vibration resonant frequencies; and generating a drive signal to drive each of the different signals where the drive signal sweeps across a predetermined range of vibration frequencies at the sweep frequency so that each of the different speakers vibrate.

In general, each of the independent claims has been amended to include a plurality of different speakers, wherein each speaker has a different resonant frequency and wherein the different speakers can be driven by *inter alia* the same sweep circuitry and drive circuitry, the same drive signal, the same sweep range, or the same sweep frequency. Thus, the presentably amended claims are drawn to having "the same drive signal can be used to vibrate each speaker at the speaker's mechanical vibration resonant frequency despite the variation in mechanical

vibration resonant frequencies among the group of speakers.” See Applicant’s Abstract, last line.

In contrast, TAKAHASHI is directed to a driving waveform that suppresses a reduction in the amount of vibration caused by dispersion in the vibration resonant frequency of an acoustic actuator, and a drive circuit for generating the driving waveform. See object of the invention at col. 2: lines 22-27. The goal in TAKAHASHI is to suppress a reduction in the maximum amount of vibration caused by dispersion in the vibration resonant frequency caused tat the time of mounting the compound acoustic actuator. Additionally, the goal is suppress the generation of harmonics. See last paragraph of Summary of invention at col. 3: lines 9-18.

Furthermore, in the first embodiment TAKAHASHI teaches only a single acoustic actuator. See col. 3: line 64 – col. 4: line 3, and col. 5: lines 40-54. Additionally, the first embodiment in TAKAHASHI only teaches amplifying signals in a relatively narrow frequency range, i.e. 132 Hz and 131 Hz, to suppress the amount of vibration caused by dispersion of the vibration resonant frequency of the acoustic actuator 3. See col. 4: lines 38-47. The second embodiment in TAKAHASHI also generates a drive signal for the single acoustic actuator 3. See col. 6: lines 5-18.

Therefore, TAKAHASHI fails to disclose a group of speakers having variations or different mechanical vibration resonant frequencies, and using the same drive signal to vibrate each of the plurality of different speakers, even though each of the speakers has a different resonant frequency. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 USC 102 has been traversed.

**B. Conclusion**

For all the foregoing reasons, an early allowance of claims 1-26 pending in the present application is respectfully requested. If necessary, applicant requests, under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application and to charge the fees for a large entity under 37 CFR 1.17(a). The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) or credit any overpayment(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-3001 of Kyocera Wireless Corp.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2007

/Jonathan T. Velasco/  
Jonathan T. Velasco  
Reg. No. 42,200

Jonathan T. Velasco  
Kyocera Wireless Corp.  
Attn: Patent Department  
P.O. Box 928289  
San Diego, California 92192-8289  
Tel: (858) 882-3501  
Fax: (858) 882-2485